THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS A WORLD HERITAGE SITE AND SUPPORT FOR SUSTAINABLE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

A. E. Mohamed, N. M. Shariff and K. Kayat

School of Tourism, Hospitality & Environmental Management,
College of Law, Government & International Studies, Universiti Utara Malaysia
06010 Sintok, Kedah, Malaysia

Email: edwin@uum.edu.my (Corresponding Author)

ABSTRACT

Residents support for sustainable tourism development is crucial especially when it comes to area designated as UNESCO World Heritage Site. Literature suggests that lack of support causes expensive future conflicts, political objection, hinder development, sour tourists-host relationship and cultural heritage properties destruction. Resident reaction towards proposed tourism development also known to be influenced by the way they perceive its impacts. Thus, this paper aims to examine the effect of perceptions towards a World Heritage Site on support for sustainable tourism development using Lenggong Valley as a case study. The outcomes of factor analysis suggest that perception towards World Heritage Site is two dimensional, which can be identified as perceived benefits and perceived costs. Regression analysis results indicated a positive relationship between perceived benefits and support for sustainable tourism development, and a negative relationship between perceived costs and support for sustainable tourism development. It is clear that the residents' perceived impacts influence the level of their support or objection towards tourism development.

Keywords: World Heritage Site, perceived benefits, perceived costs, support for sustainable tourism development

Introduction

Background and rational

The application of sustainable development in tourism industry has its origin from a report entitled "*Our Common Future"*, which was also known as the "*Brundtland Report*" published in 1987 by the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development (UNWCED). This report aimed at establishing principles and guidelines for a more sustainable future for the world's community. Such initiative was in part due to various negatives impacts on the environment, economic and socio-cultural aspects of destination in the development process (Butler, 1999; Janusz & Bajdor, 2013; Swarbrooke, 1999; Waligo, Clarks & Hawkins, 2013; World Travel & Tourism Council, 1999). Luckily today, sustainable development is a common practice in tourism development around the globe owing to its potential benefits. Buckley (2009) characterised sustainable tourism as development activities that use optimal natural and cultural resources, respects for socio-cultural values of local communities, enhance economic, social and environmental benefits, minimize the costs, and encourage active involvement of the local people. Some scholars also stressed that sustainable tourism development policy may also eliminate poverty among local people in the least developed regions (Dimoska, 2008; Roslan, Mohamed & Noor, 2007; Tosun, 2001).

In the past, tourism development often caused considerable destruction to the natural and cultural resources, economic inequality, and disintegration of local's cultural value and traditions (Ap, 1992; Bryd, Bosley, Dronberger, 2009; Gursoy, Jurowski &, Uysal, 2002; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; Jimura, 2010; Lee, 2012; Nicholas, Thapa & Ko, 2009; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011). Such impacts can be more devastating when occurred in the protected area the likes of World Heritage Sites (WHS). There were reports by United Nation Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) about the improper planning and development at WHSs that affect the outstanding universal values of the properties and the local community's wellbeing (Pederson, 2002). In particular, the degradation of heritage integrity is often irreplaceable, therefore regarded as a tragedy for the world's natural and cultural heritage. It is also important to note that, the World Heritage status is the primary motivation for tourists to visit a destination (Poria, Butler & Airey, 2003; Timothy & Boyd, 2003). Having World Heritage Status withdrawn by UNESCO as a result of a serious breach of outstanding universal value could significantly reduce the number of tourist arrival. In addition, according to World Tourism

Organization, it was estimated that almost 40 percentage of international tourists were culturally motivated which further indicate the importance of heritage value (Timothy & Boyd, 2003).

Similarly, Lenggong Valley that is the latest edition in Malaysia's World Heritage List holds a great potential for tourism. This particular tourism destination however relies heavily on the preservation of its cultural and historical values. To enable such protection, various policies have long been formulated to support sustainable tourism development in the country such as Five Years Economic Plan, National Tourism Policy, National Ecotourism Plan, Malaysia Tourism Transformation Plan, and down to the state level such as structural plans and district plans. Despite the above policies, questions pertaining to what extent the stakeholders are committed and supportive for such policies are still largely unanswered. This is crucial because the literature strongly suggests that lack of support causes expensive future conflicts, political objection, hinder development, sour tourists-host relationship and cultural heritage properties destruction which then lead to unsustainable tourism development (Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Cheng, 1980; Jurowski, Uysal & Williams, 1997; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; Maikhuri, Nautiyal, Rao, & Saxena, 2001; Pearce, 1980). This also means that tourism development itself could not be effectively implemented without support from stakeholders especially the local residents (Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004).

The study area, Lenggong is a sub-district within Hulu Perak in the State of Perak. Until today, it is still under-developed rural area mainly dominated by agricultural and logging activities. Only recently, some tourism activities have been recorded though not very significance. Using visitor arrival data obtained from Lenggong Archaeological Museum as an indicator, a total of 78,000 visitors recorded in 2009 (Lenggong Archaeological Museum, 2010). Lenggong Valley became an important archaeological site in Malaysia partly attributed to the excavation of 'Perak Man' which has been dated to be about 11,000 years old (Zuraina, 1994; 2005). This is one of the most complete prehistoric human skeletons from Palaeolithic period that have ever been found in South East Asia region. It was discovered in 1991 at Gua Gunung Runtuh by Zuraina Majid, an Archaeologist from Universiti Sains Malaysia. This discovery has contributed to a crucial part of South East Asia and Australomelanesoid early history. Besides this infamous discovery of 'Perak Man', there were many other great discoveries that have taken place in this very small district. Among others were the excavations of 100,000 years old stone tools at Kampong Geluk and Kampong Temelong. In addition to that, a site of an old stone tool workshop was also found in Kota Tampan. A radio-carbon dating indicated the site to be 30,000 years old. Other excavations in Bukit Bunuh have led to the discovery of the earliest known site of human inhabitant in South East Asia which believed to take place some 1.8 million years ago. This finding could very well rewrite the theory of great human migration from Africa to Australia and to other parts of South Pacific island countries.

With regards to the above cultural significances, the Department of National Heritage Malaysia nominated the Archaeological Heritage of Lenggong Valley (or in short, Lenggong Valley) as the UNESCO World Heritage Site in December 2009 (Loh, 2009, December 17th). Three years later, in June 2012 this site was officially inscribed on the UNESCO's World Heritage List under the category of Prehistoric Archaeological Heritage for its outstanding universal values (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2012). The designation of Lenggong Valley as a world heritage is expected to further elevate the local tourism industry to another level. In fact, even prior to this, plan was already in place to develop Lenggong as a primary heritage destination in the country as embedded in the District of Hulu Perak Local Plan for 2002 – 2015 (Perak State Town and Country Planning Department, 2002).

Purposes of the study

In line with the above interest, the purposes of this study were:

i. To identify the level of support for sustainable tourism development among local residents in Lenggong.
ii. To examine the influences of perceived benefits of WHS on support for sustainable tourism development.
iii. To examine the influences of perceived costs of WHS on support for sustainable tourism development.

Literature Review

Before the literature begins discussing previous studies on this topic, it is crucial to understand what constitute 'support'. Support for tourism can be best explained using Social Exchange Theory (Ap, 1992; Kayat, 2002). The theory postulates that when a person forms a positive evaluation of exchange consequence, he or she will enter into the exchange. On the other hand, if a person has a negative evaluation of exchange consequence, he or she will withdraw from the exchange and thus lead to no-exchange. This behavioural intention (exchange or no-exchange) is also known as social impact outcomes (Deery, Jago & Fredline, 2012). Here, social impact outcomes can be in the forms of involvement, collaboration, support or opposition towards tourism industry.

Pham (2006) further elaborates support as "*residents' endorsement and inclination towards policies, programmes, plans, projects, and any social changes process invoked by those interventions*".

Studies in the past indicated that support for tourism can be influenced by various factors, including community attachment, level of participation, trust in government actors, and personal benefits received. However, one of the most dominance is perceived impacts (e.g. Allen, Hafer, Long & Perdue, 2003; Gursoy et al., 2002; Lee, 2013; Nunkoo, Gursoy & Juwaheer, 2010; Nicholas et al. 2009; Perdue, Long & Allen, 1987). Perceived impacts of tourism development can be seen from several major perspectives, namely economic impacts, social impacts, and environmental impacts (Hanafiah, Jamaluddin & Zulkifly, 2013; Nunkoo et al, 2010; Teye, Sonmez & Sirakaya, 2002). The economic impacts from tourism may consist of employment opportunities, business expansion, investment funds, cottage industry growth, cost of living and so forth. Meanwhile, social impacts may relate to community pride, adoption of foreign culture, congestion, loss of privacy, crime and prostitutions. Tourism also creates various environmental problems such as waste, air and water pollution, forest clearance, and many more.

The majority of studies found significant relationship between both perceived benefits and perceived costs, and support for tourism development (Lee, 2012; Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Ritchie, 1988; Perdue et al., 1987; Prentice, 1993; Vargas-Sánchez, Porras-Bueno & Plaza-Mejía, 2009). Although the number of studies on this topic is in abundance, some inconsistencies still exist on the effects of perceived impacts on support for tourism development. Some studies indicated that there was no significant relationship found between perceived costs and support for tourism (e.g. Gursoy et al. 2002; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004). In their studies, only perceived benefits form significant relationship with support for tourism. This may be due to over emphasizing on economic benefits of tourism than other negative impacts associated with it, especially in the case of regions with desperate economic condition. This inconsistency of result could also be attributed by mediating factors such as occupational identity, level of satisfaction, and religious values.

The above literature has been focusing on the impacts of tourism in general, not on the impacts of WHS towards the local residents. Perceptions towards WHS represent not only the impacts on the local's economy, environment and socio-cultural aspects as a result of tourism, but to what extent the mandatory conservation of the heritage sites affects the land use conflicts and other economic activities. This aspect is rarely examined in the literature, thus justifying the need for this current study. Some experts suggest that WHS designation impose a different set of impacts on the community (Jimura, 2010; Nicholas et al., 2009; Maikhuri et al., 2001). For example, protected area the likes of WHS impose sanction on other competing economic activities. This is highlighted in previous studies where local residents loss economic opportunities in resources-based occupations the likes of agriculture, mining and forestry as a result of conservation programmes (Karanth, Kramer, Qian & Christensen 2008; Sekhar, 2003). Further study on how WHS designation impacts local residents in the case of Malaysia is also yet to be established. The findings may shed some light on whether WHS designation leads to positive or negative impacts on the local residents.

Based on the literature review above, two hypothesis statements were formulated as follow:

H1: There is a positive relationship between perceived benefits of WHS and support for sustainable tourism development

H2: There is a negative relationship between perceived costs of WHS and support for sustainable tourism development

Methodology

This section describes important research protocols including the instrument development, sampling procedure, data collection, and data analysis. The field work for this study took place in Lenggong District between June and August 2013. Lenggong District has the current population of 18,086 people or 3,759 households dispersed into 18 villages (Lenggong District Council, 2010).

Research instrument

A quantitative survey used to identify residents perceptions towards WHS in Lenggong Valley and the extent of their support for sustainable tourism development. The study explored the residents' perception towards WHS from two perspectives; perceived benefits and perceived costs. In order to ascertain its content validity, the items were adopted from previous empirical studies (i.e. Besculides et al., 2002; Jimura, 2010; Karanth et al., 2008; Maikhuri et al., 2001; Nicholas et al., 2009). In addition to that, local experts were also involved in refining the instruments, which include two academic staff from University Sains Malaysia and an officer from Lenggong District Council in determining the suitability of the items in the local context. This exercise was then followed by face validity whereby the questionnaire was administered to a small group of

respondents from the study area in order to eliminate any ambiguity and misinterpretation. After the content validity and face validity have been satisfied, a pilot study involving a total of 30 local residents was implemented. The pilot study is to ensure the reliability and accuracy of survey instruments before proceeding with the actual data collection.

The questionnaire in this study was divided into four main sections of resident profiles, perceived benefits, perceived costs, and support for sustainable tourism development. The items used in this study are presented in the table below:

Table 1: Items for perceptions towards WHS

No.	Items
	Perceived Benefits
1	The protection of WHS benefits future generation [a]
2	It is important to protect the WHS for the survival of various archaeological artefacts [a]
3	Being part of community rich in culture & history [b]
4	Improving community's physical infrastructure [b]
5	Offer recreational activities for the locals [b]
6	Growth of local cottage industries [b]
7	Tourism development potentials [b]
8	Outsiders/tourists encroachment to the area [b]
9	Recognition as WHS [c]
	Perceived Disbenefits
10	The WHS does not provide jobs for people in our community [a]
11	The WHS has created problems in my life [a]
12	The WHS is too large and take up too much land space [a]
13	Restrictions on other economic activities (e.g. agriculture, mining, logging) [c]
14	Restrictions on future development potential (housing area, commercial area, industrial area etc.) [c]

Note:
[a] Scale items were developed and validated in previous studies (Nicholas et. al., 2009).
[b] Scales items were adapted from Besculides et al (2002); Karanth et. al. (2008); Maikhuri et. al. (2001).
[c] Scale items were developed via preliminary interviews with local authorities that are responsible for the management of WHS.

The following table on the other hand, depict items used to measure support for sustainable tourism development which were adopted from Nicholas et al. (2009).

Table 2: Items for support for sustainable tourism development

No.	Items
1	Development of community-based tourism initiatives
2	Local involvement in tourism planning and development
3	Cooperation and unity in tourism planning and development
4	Promotion of heritage education and conservation
5	Commitment in adhering to the regulations & guidelines to maintain the WHS
6	Protection of Lenggong Valley as UNESCO WHS
7	Support any penalty imposed to those who destroy the WHS
8	Don't care about development activities that jeopardize the integrity of WHS

Note:
Scale items were adapted from previous study by Nicholas et al. (2009).

Sampling procedures

Proportionate random sampling method was used to achieve representative from the whole district of Lenggong. The number of questionnaire distributed is 450 with 401 valid responses. Respondents were given a total of 22 questions based on 7-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree; 7=strongly agree). The appropriate sample size recommended by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) for 3,759 populations is 351. The following table shows the proportionate random sampling of villages in Lenggong.

Table 3: Proportioned random sampling

No	Village	Mukim	Household number	Sample size
1	Gua Badak	Lenggong	257	56
2	Gelok	Lenggong	354	76
3	Lenggong Town	Lenggong	566	122
4	Banggol Batu	Temelong	444	96
5	Luat	Temelong	266	58
6	Beng	Durian Pipit	191	42
	TOTAL		2,078	450

Data collection

The data were collected using self-administered questionnaire distributed by well-trained enumerators. The enumerators visited houses within these villages randomly. The systematic random sampling of households was not possible as the list of all households in Lenggong were not provided by the District Office due to confidentiality reasons. Without the sampling frame, the best method of respondent selection is simple random sampling.

Data analysis

The data were treated using IBM's Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS 19.0) that produced the outcomes of descriptive statistics, factor analysis, and multiple-regression.

Result and Discussion

This section presents the outcomes for the demographic profiles of the respondents, residents' perceptions towards WHS and its relationship with support for sustainable tourism development.

Profile of respondents

The following table presents statistics regarding respondents' demographics profiles including gender, age, ethnicity, place of birth, and education level.

Table 4: Profiles of respondents

Parameter		Frequency	Valid Percentage
Gender	Male	193	48.3
	Female	207	51.8
Age	21 – 30	152	38.0
	31 – 40	87	21.8
	41 – 50	76	19.0
	51 – 60	52	13.0
	Above 60	33	8.3
Ethnicity	Malay	379	94.5
	Chinese	11	2.7
	Indian	5	1.2
	Siamese	6	1.5
Place of birth	Lenggong	297	76.0
	Other than Lenggong	94	24.0
Education level	Did not go to school	23	5.8
	Primary school	53	13.4
	Secondary school	254	64.0
	First degree	60	15.1
	Post-graduate	6	1.5
	Others	1	0.3

Missing data

In total there were 20 missing data occurred for both variables; perceptions towards WHS (11 missing data) and for support for sustainable tourism development (9 missing data). The most missing data for perceptions toward WHS was on item "tourism development potentials" (5 data points), meanwhile for support for sustainable tourism development, the most missing data was recorded on item "I don't care about the development activities that jeopardize the integrity of WHS" (3 data points). The missing data was then replaced with the mean value of score of respective items.

The negative statements in the questionnaires were also recorded before further multivariate analyses can be applied. This is to include perceptions towards WHS designation (a total of six statements were recoded including items no 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15), meanwhile, within support for sustainable tourism development (only one item was recoded, which is item no 8).

Factor analysis

Factor analysis was conducted on both independent (perception towards WHS) and dependent variables (support for sustainable tourism development).

Perceptions towards World Heritage Site

The 14 items in the perceptions towards WHS scale subjected to principal component analysis. A total of 3 items with low factor loading of below 0.45 were deleted. The questionnaire items deleted were no. 5, 7 and 10. The measure of sampling adequacy using The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin produced a value of 0.887 exceeding the minimum value of 0.6 as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). A correlation matrix analysis also indicated that the majority of coefficient correlations were above 0.3, which signal the suitability of data for factor analysis. The Bartlett's test of Sphericity reached statistical significant (p<0.05), supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix.

The principal component analysis revealed the presence of two factors which have eigenvalues exceeding 1. Factor 1 explains 45.9 percent of the variance, meanwhile factor 2 explains 15.3 percent of variance. With reference to previous studies, Factor 1 is named as "perceived benefits of WHS" and Factor 2 as "perceived costs of WHS" (i.e. Besculides, 2002; Jimura, 2010; Maikhuri et al., 2001; Nicholas et al., 2009). The details of factor loading are presented in the Table 5 below:

Table 5: Factor loading for perceptions towards WHS designation
(Original questionnaire number given the bracket)

Items	Factor loading	
The protection of WHS benefits future generation (1)	**.778**	
It is important to protect the WHS for the survival of various archaeological artefacts (2)	**.797**	
Being part of community rich in culture and history (3)	**.692**	
Improving community's physical infrastructure (4)	**.790**	
Growth of local cottage industries (6)	**.677**	
Outsiders/tourists encroachment to the area (8)	**.725**	
Recognition as WHS (9)	**.626**	
The WHS has created problems in my life (11)		**.800**
The WHS is too large and take up too much land space (12)		**.778**
Restrictions on other economic activities (e.g. agriculture, mining, logging) (13)		**.845**
Restrictions on future development potential (housing area, commercial area, industrial area etc.) (14)		**.797**
Eigenvalue	**5.056**	**1.683**
% of explained variance	**45.963**	**15.298**

Support for sustainable tourism development

The 6 items under the support for sustainable tourism development scale was also subjected to the principle component analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value that measure sampling adequacy was found to be at 0.873 exceeding the minimum value of 0.6 as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). The majority coefficient correlations values as a result of correlation matrix analysis were above 0.3 indicating the data suitability for factor analysis. The Bartlett's test of sphericity reached statistical significant (p<0.01), supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. The principal component analysis indicated the presence of one factor with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining a total of 60.5 percent of the variance.

Table 6: Factor loading for support for sustainable tourism development
(Original questionnaire number given the bracket)

Items	Factor loading
Development of community-based tourism initiatives (1)	**.833**
Local involvement in tourism planning and development (2)	**.831**
Cooperation and unity in tourism planning and development (3)	**.811**
Promotion of heritage education and conservation (4)	**.772**
Commitment in adhering to the regulations & guidelines to maintain the WHS (5)	**.811**
The designation of Lenggong Valley as UNESCO's WHS (6)	**.577**
Eigenvalue	**3.629**
% of explained variance	**60.490**

After factor analysis, Cronbach's alpha test was then performed in order to examine the reliability of questionnaire items as suggested by Sekaran (2000) and Bryman and Cramer (1990). The test indicated that Cronbach' alpha values for perceived benefits of WHS (.869), perceived costs of WHS (.853), and support for sustainable tourism development (.869). These Cronbach's alpha values are exceeding 0.7, which is acceptable in social science research (Hair et al. 2010).

Descriptive analysis

The descriptive analyses for perceived benefits, perceived costs of WHS, and support for sustainable tourism development are shown in Table 7. The mean for perceived benefits is relatively high indicating strong agreement among local residents regarding the benefits of WHS compared to perceived costs. Respondents were also highly supportive of sustainable tourism development as shown in the table 7.

Table 7: Descriptive statistics

Items	Mean	Standard deviations
Perceived benefits of WHS designation		
Benefits future generation (1)	6.57	.685
It is important to protect the WHS for the survival of various archaeological artefacts (2)	6.53	.710
Being part of community rich in culture and history (3)	6.52	.704
Improving community's physical infrastructure (4)	6.40	.778
Growth of local cottage industries (6)	6.23	.871
Outsiders/tourists encroachment to the area (8)	6.43	.771
Recognition as WHS (9)	6.64	.798
Perceived costs of WHS designation		
The WHS has created problems in my life (11)	1.39	.781
The WHS is too large and take up too much land space (12)	1.77	1.099
Restrictions on other economic activities (e.g. agriculture, mining, logging) (13)	1.57	.866
Restrictions on future development potential (housing area, commercial area, industrial area etc.) (14)	1.63	.942
Support for sustainable tourism development		
Development of community-based tourism initiatives (1)	5.88	1.176
Local involvement in tourism planning and development (2)	5.86	1.187
Cooperation and unity in tourism planning and development (3)	5.95	1.057
Promotion of heritage education and conservation (4)	6.17	.960
Commitment in adhering to the regulations & guidelines to maintain the WHS (5)	6.01	1.148
The designation of Lenggong Valley as UNESCO's WHS (6)	6.63	.760

Multiple regression

Correlation and multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between independent variables (i.e. perceived benefits of WHS; perceived costs of WHS) and dependent variable (i.e. support for sustainable tourism development). Table 8 summarises the descriptive statistics and analysis results.

Table 8: Descriptive statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Support	6.0864	.80390	401
Perceived benefit	6.4472	.53792	401
Perceived costs	1.6592	.79944	401

As can be seen in Table 9 below, perceived benefit is positively and significantly correlated with the dependent variable (.395) , indicating that those with higher scores on this variable tend to have higher support for sustainable tourism development. However, perceived cost of WHS was found to have a negative and significant relationship with support. This means those with high score on this variable tend to have little support for sustainable tourism development then the rest.

Table 9: Correlation matrix

		Support	Perceived benefits	Perceived costs
Support	Pearson Correlation	1	.395**	-.327**
(criterion variable)	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	401	401	401

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The multiple regression model with all two predictors produced $R^2 = .185$, $F(2, 398) = 45.091$, $p<.01$. The R^2 value represent the percentage of variability in the dependent variable is accounted for by all the independent variables. According to Kinner and Grey (2004), R^2 value more than .10 is considered to be a large effect size.

Table 10: Model summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.430[a]	.185	.181	.72768

a. Predictors: (Constant), perceived benefits, perceived costs

Table 11: ANOVA results

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	47.754	2	23.877	45.091	.000[a]
	Residual	210.750	398	.530		
	Total	258.503	400			

a. Predictors: (Constant), perceived benefits, perceived costs
b. Dependent Variable: support

Thus, based on the above model, the equation for the regression line is:

y = 3.408 + 0.464 (perceived benefits) + -0.190 (perceived costs)

The following Table 12 depicts some statistical results including unstandardized coefficients, t-values, and significant level.

Table 12: Coefficients

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	3.408	.531		6.417	.000
	Perceived benefits	.464	.076	.311	6.150	.000
	Perceived costs	-.190	.051	-.189	-3.746	.000

a. Dependent Variable: support

CONCLUSION

Residents of Lenggong in general were very supportive of sustainable tourism development plans within WHS. The high level of support also means that they were willing to involve in the planning of tourism development, tourism-related activities, promotion of heritage, and maintaining the outstanding universal values of WHS. Such high level of support was mainly influenced by the positive attitudes that local residents formed towards the impacts of WHS designation. The findings also indicated that perceived costs may lead to some opposition towards tourism development. In conclusion, this study produced result that is consistent with many other previous studies on this topic (Lee, 2012; Nicholas et al., 2009; Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Ritchie, 1988; Perdue et al., 1987; Prentice, 1993; Vargas-Sanchez et al., 2009).

For future research, it is suggested to include other variables that may improve the variance that explain support for sustainable tourism development. These may covers variables such as occupational identity, religious values, state of local economy, and political affiliations. A longitudinal study is also crucial to examine the changes in residents' attitudes towards tourism industry as stated in Butler' tourism life cycle model. This current study merely examined residents attitudes towards tourism at the beginning stage of tourism life cycle, where the majority of residents were very much excited about what is to come.

References:

Allen, L. R., Hafer, H. R., Long, R. & Perdue, R. R. (1993). Rural residents' attitudes toward recreation and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research 31*(4), 27–33.

Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research, 19*(4), 665–690.

Besculides, A., Lee, M. E., & McCormick, P. J. (2002). Residents' perceptions of the cultural benefits. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(2), 303–319.

Buckley, R. (1999). Sustainable tourism: Research and reality. *Annals of Tourism Research, 39*(2), 528-546.

Butler, R. W. (1999). Sustainable tourism: State-of-the-art review. Tourism Geography, *1*(1), 7-25.

Bryman, A. & Cramer, D. (1990). *Quantitative Data Analysis for Social Scientist*. London: Routledge

Byrd, E. T., Bosley, H. E., & Dronberger, M. G. (2009). Comparisons of stakeholder perceptions of tourism impacts in rural eastern North Carolina. *Tourism Management, 30*(5), 693–703.

Deery, M., Jago, L., & Fredline, L. (2012). Rethinking social impacts of tourism research: A new research agenda. *Tourism Management, 33*(1), 64–73.

Dimoska, T. (2008). Sustainable tourism development as a tool for poverty reduction. *Economics and Organization, 5*(2), 173-178.

Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D. G. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 31*(3), 495–516.

Gursoy, D., Juroswki, C. and Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(1), 79–105.

Hanafiah, M. H., Jamaluddin, M. R., & Zulkifly, M. I. (2013). Local community attitude and support towards tourism development in Tioman Island, Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 105*, 792–800.

Janusz, G. K., & Bajdor, P. (2013). Towards to Sustainable Tourism – Framework, Activities and Dimensions. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 6*(13), 523–529.

Jimura, T. (2011). The impact of world heritage site designation on local communities – A case study of Ogimachi, Shirakawa-mura, Japan. *Tourism Management, 32*(2), 288–296.

Karanth, K. K., Kramer, R. A., Qian, S. S. & Christensen, N. L. (2008). Examining conservation attitudes, perspectives, and challenges in India. *Biological Conservation*, 141(9), 2357-2367.

Kayat, K. (2002). Power, social exchanges and tourism in Langkawi: Rethinking resident perceptions. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4, 171-191.

Kinner and Grey (2004). *SPSS 12 Made Simple*. London: Psychology Press.

Krejcie, R. & Morgan, D. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.

Lee, T. H. (2013). Influence analysis of community resident support for sustainable tourism development. *Tourism Management, 34*, 37–46.

Lenggong Archaeological Museum (2010). *Visitors Statistics.*

Lenggong District Council (2010). *Projection of Local Population*.

Maikhuri, R. K., Nautiyal, S., Rao, K. S., & Saxena, K. G. (2001). Conservation policy–people conflicts: a case study from Nanda Devi Biosphere Reserve (a World Heritage Site), India. *Forest Policy and Economics, 2*(3-4), 355–365.

Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1988). Social impact of tourism on Central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15, 208–220.

Nicholas, L. N., Thapa, B., & Ko, Y. J. (2009). Residents' perspectives of a World Heritage Site. *Annals of Tourism Research, 36*(3), 390–412.

Nunkoo, R., Gursoy, D., & Juwaheer, T. D. (2010). Island residents' identities and their support for tourism: an integration of two theories. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 18*(5), 675–693.

Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2011). Developing a community support model for tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 38*(3), 964–988.

Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1987). Rural resident perceptions and attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14, 420-429.

Pham, H. L. (2006). *Residents' Perception of Tourism Impacts and Their Support for Tourism Development: The Case of Cucphuong National Park, Ninh Binh, Vietnam*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Sintok: Universiti Utara Malaysia

Prentice, R. (1993). Community-driven tourism planning and residents' preferences. *Tourism Management*, 14, 218-227.
Ritchie, J. R. B. (1988). Consensus policy formulation in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 9, 199-216.
Roslan, A. H., Mohamed, A. E. & Zamuri Noor, M. S. (2007). The poverty impact of the tourism industry: A case study of Langkawi. *Asean Journal on Hospitality and Tourism*, 6 (2).
Sekaran, U. (2003*). Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach, 4th ed*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
Sekhar, N. U. (2003). Local people's attitudes towards conservation and wildlife tourism around Sariska Tiger Reserve, India. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 69, 339-347.
Swarbrooke, J. (1999). Sustainable Tourism Management. Scheffield Hallan University, UK.
Tabachnick & Fidell (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics, 5th ed*. Northridge: Pearson Education.
Teye, V., Sonmez, S. F., & Sirakaya, E. (2002). Residents' attitudes towards tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *29*(3), 668–688.
Tosun, C. (2001). Challenges of sustainable tourism development in the developing world: The case of Turkey. *Tourism Management*, *22*(3), 289–303.
Vargas-Sánchez, A., Porras-Bueno, N., & Plaza-Mejía, M. D. L. Á. (2011). Explaining residents' attitudes to tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *38*(2), 460–480.
Waligo, V. M., Clarke, J., & Hawkins, R. (2013). Implementing sustainable tourism: A multi-stakeholder involvement management framework. *Tourism Management*, *36*, 342–353.
World Commission on Environment and Development (1987). *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
World Travel & Tourism Council (1999). *Tourism and Sustainable Development: The Global Importance of Tourism*. London: WTTC.
Zuraina (1994). *The Excavation Gua Gunung Runtuh and The Discovery of the Perak Man in Malaysia*. Department of Museums and Antiquities, Malaysia (Kuala Lumpur).
Zuraina (2005). The excavation and analyses of the Perak Man buried in Gua Gunung Runtuh, Lenggong, Perak. *In Zuraina Majid (ed.) The Perak Man and Other Prehistoric Skeletons of Malaysia*. Centre for Archaeological Research Malaysia, USM, Penang.